DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 925 RC 013 902

AUTHOR Rice, Joseph P.
TITLE California Mini-Corps Evaluation Report School Year 1980.
INSTITUTION Butte County Superintendent of Schools. Oroville, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 32p.; For related document, see ED 137 039.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Community Involvement; Inservice Education; *Migrant Education; *Program Effectiveness; Recordkeeping; School Community Relationship; Self Evaluation (Individuals); *State Programs; *Supervision; *Teacher Aides; Teacher Interns; Teacher Supervision; Validated Programs; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS *California Mini Corps; National Diffusion Network Programs

ABSTRACT

Using data obtained from external evaluators, teacher assistants, and coordinators, the evaluation examined the supervision provided by team leaders/coordinators; inservice programs offered for Mini-Corps students by team leaders; whether teacher assistants were serving identified migrant pupils and functioning at levels of competence commensurate with their training and skills; coordinators' job performance; record keeping and thoroughness of teacher assistant profiles and records; the quality of record keeping by teacher assistants to monitor migrant pupil progress; central Mini-Corps administrative and support services available for college coordinators; the extent of community involvement; supervising teachers' use of teacher assistants in compliance with Mini-Corps objectives; and work load of coordinators and teacher assistants. Findings included: the highest rated factors were the quality of classroom teaching experience, the overall quality of inservice training, and school and community acceptance of the Mini-Corps program; four areas failed to meet Mini-Corps standards (quality of college course work, communications with statewide Mini-Corps, effectiveness of the home visitation program, and communications with migrant education regional personnel); more teacher assistants were rated "fair or poor"; there were lowered standards of supervision; and self ratings dropped indicating that teacher assistants perceived their deficits. This report provides data supporting the evaluation findings. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226925

california mini-corps

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Herbert C. White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SCHOOL YEAR EVALUATION REPORT 1980

RC01 3902

2

NDN - FUNDED DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATOR PROJECT

A COMPONENT OF THE CALIFORNIA PLAN FOR THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN
E.S.E.A., TITLE 1, P.L. 95-561

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALIFORNIA MINI-CORPS
MIGRANT TEACHER ASSISTANT CORPS

SCHOOL YEAR REPORT, 1980

SUBMITTED AUGUST 1980
TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION

CARLOS GONZALES
DIRECTOR OF MIGRANT EDUCATION

BY

THE BUTTE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OFFICE
OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA
DUANE G. POWERS, SUPERINTENDENT

HERBERT C. WHITE, STATE DIRECTOR

JESSE CAMACHO
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

JOSEPH P. RICE, Ph.D.
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

ISIDRO TARANGO
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

CALIFORNIA MINI-CORPS
MIGRANT TEACHER ASSISTANT CORPS
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED BY

JOSEPH P. RICE, Ph.D., ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA MINI-CORPS
SUMMATIVE EVALUATOR

CONTRIBUTING FORMATIVE EVALUATORS

Margaret Hibbits, M.A., Ret. School Psychologist, Lompoc Unified School District
Francisco F. Ivarra, Ph.D., Director of Curriculum Development, School Social Worker
California State University, Fresno
Alexander Martin, M.A., Teacher, San Ysidro Unified School District
Henry Peterson, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychology
California State University, Chico

Data Compilation and Typing:

Caroline Fernandes, assisted by staff

SUMMARY FINDINGS FOR ELEVEN 1979-80 SCHOOL YEAR TEACHER ASSISTANT PROGRAMS

SUMMARY FINDINGS - (Data supporting these findings follow in the next section)

1.0 Contrasted with 1978-79 ratings when 97% of the college coordinators obtained "good to excellent ratings" on their job performance, teacher assistants rated this group as 52% excellent, 31% good, 7% fair, 8% needs improvement and 2% poor. This lowered rating was verified by external evaluators' overall ratings with 5 rating coordinators as "excellent", 3 as "good", 3 as "fair" and 1 as "poor". 4 of 12 coordinators accounted for most of the ratings below "good".

2.0 A wide variety of inservice training workshops were offered, but 92% of the teacher assistants continue to rate such workshops as "excellent or good".

3.0 External evaluators unanimously agreed that teacher assistants were exclusively serving identified migrant pupils.

4.0 External evaluator reports documented the following findings:

4.1 Evaluators unanimously answered "yes" to the proposition that "teacher assistants are functioning at levels of competence commensurate with their training and skills." 5 programs were rated "excellent" for this factor, 6 were rated "good".

4.2 Inservice training programs were rated "excellent" for 4 programs, "good" for 3 programs, "fair" for 3 programs and "poor" for 1 program - this result is lower than the teacher assistants rated these programs.

4.3 External evaluators reported that 8 programs were and 3 programs were not receiving "adequate supervision" by the college coordinators. Overall supervision was rated as "excellent" for 5 programs, "good" for 3 programs, "fair" for 2 programs and "poor" for 1 program.

4.4 Seven evaluators reported that coordinators were "keeping adequate teacher assistant records" and 4 reported that "they were not". General record keeping was rated "excellent" for 4 programs, "good" for 2 programs and only "fair" for 5 programs. Half of the coordinators filed all of the essential accountability data required by management.

4.5 Records to monitor migrant pupil progress were kept by 7 and not maintained for 4 of the 11 programs studied. The quality of such pupil records was rated as "excellent" for 5 programs, "good" for 2 programs and "fair" for 4 programs.

4.6 Central Mini-Corps administrative and support services available for college coordinators were rated as "excellent" for 5 programs, "good" for 5 programs and "needs improvement" for 1 program. 10 of 11 evaluations showed that "crisis intervention services and timely communications" were readily available for the statewide program system.

4.7 While 7 evaluators' reports documented that "the importance of community involvement is stressed by the college coordinators" and 4 reported that the coordinators did not stress the importance of community involvement, only 6 of 11 programs were found to be actually conducting home visits. The Mini-Corps policy with regard to home visits needs to be reassessed by management.

4.8 Evaluators unanimously concluded that "supervising teachers use the teacher assistants in compliance with Mini-Corps objectives." Also, teacher assistants tended to rate their supvervising teachers higher than their college coordinators. This finding suggests that the relationship between supervising teachers and teacher assistants remains the most fundamental role the Mini-Corps supports. It suggests the possibility of reinstituting an honorarium for master teacher supervision and the extension of the coordinators' role to accommodate more teacher assistants and a lesser classroom role.

5.0 About 28% of coordinators total time was expended on supervision, a figure which falls short of the expected standard of 50%, administrative workloads have increased to 12.5% of total workload. A generous portion of total time (14.7%) is devoted to professional growth.

6.0 The average coordinator expended .499 hours per week supervising teacher assistants as compared with an expected standard of 1.0 hour per week. Only one of 10 coordinators measured met the 1.0 standard. The highest hour per week supervision average ratio was 1.043 and the lowest was .143.

7.0 From teacher assistants evaluations, four areas failed to meet Mini-Corps standards (i.e. 75% "excellent + good" ratings), these were:

7.1 The quality of college course work
7.2 Communications with statewide Mini-Corps
7.3 Effectiveness of the home visitation program and
7.4 Communications with migrant education regional personnel

The highest rated factors were: The quality of classroom teaching experience, the overall quality of inservice training and school and community acceptance of the Mini-Corps program.

8.0 Workload (e.g. actual time expended in contact with migrant pupils) continues to improve. For 1978-79, the average teacher assistant worked 67.29 hours per month, for 1979-80, the average teacher assistant worked 72.18 hours per month. 63% of this workload is devoted to direct instructional services with most time spent on English Language, Arts, ESL, and Math Instruction.

9.0 Student ratings dropped from the 1978-79 standard with more teacher assistants being rated "fair or poor". This finding may be related to the lowered standards of supervision noted in sections 1.0, 4.3, 5.0 and 6.0 cited above. Self ratings also dropped indicating that the teacher assistants perceive their deficits. Among the 5 Mini-Corps performance objectives, lowered teacher assistant performance (over 1978-79) was noted for: Prescriptive competencies, English communication skills, and Spanish linguistic studies.

DATA

The following data support the summary statements presented above. For summary statement 1.0, data supporting this finding are also designated "1.0", for summary 2.0, data supporting the findings are designated "2.0" and so forth.

1.0 Individual coordinator summary ratings for teacher assistants follow by percent:

COORDINATOR	RATINGS				
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement	Poor
A	89	11			
B	86	14			
C	79	21			
D	75		25		
E	59	41			
(Average)	(52)	(31)	(7)	(8)	(1)
F	50	50			
G	50	17	17	17	
H	43	57			
I	38	38	15		8
J	25	25	33	17	
K		38	13	50	
(Last year's average)	(69)	(28)	(3)		
(Mini-Corps minimum standard)	(38)	(38)	(25)		

TABLE 1

GROUP COORDINATOR EVALUATIONS BY TEACHER ASSISTANTS

NUMBER OF COORDINATORS = 12 RATED BY NUMBER OF TEACHER ASSISTANTS = 147

RESPONSE CODE:	SA STRONGLY AGREE A AGREE N NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE D DISAGREE SD STRONGLY DISAGREE NA DOES NOT APPLY					
	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1. I have become more competent due to my experience in M/C this year.	50%	45%	4%		1%	
2. I have increased my overall knowledge of subject matters for migrant children.	41%	51%	6%	1%		
3. I feel challenged professionally by my work with M/C.	46%	43%	7%	3%		1%
4. The coordinator presented a useful inservice program.	38%	46%	11%	4%		1%
5. The coordinator attempts to cover too much course material in one inservice workshop.	8%	15%	27%	36%	11%	3%
6. The coordinator gives assignments that are too time consuming.	5%	10%	24%	39%	13%	9%
7. The coordinator encourages students to express opinions.	44%	41%	8%	4%	1%	1%
8. The coordinator encourages group discussion.	46%	37%	8%	4%	1%	3%
9. The coordinator is receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints.	44%	35%	14%	5%	1%	1%
10. The coordinator has the inservice training program well organized.	30%	44%	15%	5%	5%	1%
11. The coordinator's directions are fair and easy to understand.	36%	50%	10%	1%	1%	1%
12. The coordinator relates course concepts in a systematic manner to our field work with migrant children.	31%	44%	16%	4%	3%	3%
13. The coordinator seems to enjoy teaching and other duties related to coordinating of our local M/C program.	43%	35%	10%	6%	1%	5%
14. The coordinator is a dynamic and energetic person.	41%	35%	14%	5%	3%	1%
15. The coordinator is enthusiastic about the M/C program.	50%	34%	10%	2%	3%	1%
16. I received sufficient career counseling from the coordinator.	33%	31%	20%	7%	5%	5%
17. I genuinely helped increase the academic proficiency of migrant pupils with whom I worked.	42%	49%	5%	2%		2%
18. My classroom experience was appropriate and rewarding.	52%	41%	4%	1%	1%	1%
19. I rate this coordinator as follows:	E	G	F	NI	P	--
	52%	31%	7%	8%	1%	--

E=Excellent G=Good F=Fair NI=Needs Improvement P=Poor

2.0 Ratings of all inservice workshops evaluated by teacher assistants follow by percent:

Title of Workshop	Number	Very High	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Low
Modesto Conference	22	77	9	14		
Mini-Corps Conference	4	25	25	50		
Migrant Education	30	30	47	23		
Bicultural Awareness	6	33	50	17		
Questioning Techniques	1			100		
Developmental Learning	13	85		15		
Introduction	1	100				
Teaching Objectives	10	60		30	10	
Puppets	35	51	31	17		
QSE	20	45	30	25		
Health	14	29	36	29		7
Math	12	42	42	17		
Classroom Management	13	31	46	23		
Science	15	40	27	33		
Expressions	5	100				
Counseling	6	50	50			
Special Education	17	17	24	58		
Nutrition	1	100				
Music	16	56	38	6		
Concepts of Migrant Children	3	33	67			
DLI	7	71		29		
Teaching	8		50	38		12
ESL	18	67	33			
Resource Materials	6	50	17	33		
Espanol Sur Oeste	11	91		9		
Positive Reinforcement	2		100			
Handwriting	4	50		50		
Equal Opportunity	3	100				
Simbolos	1	100				
Discipline	39	67	21	13		
Outdoor	2	50	50			
Reading	21	24	67	10		
Kinder Activities	5	40	60			
Assertiveness Training	5	20	80			
Arts & Crafts	27	67	22	11		
Story Telling	14	93	7			
Orientation	21	5	57	38		
Evaluation Review	4	25	75			
Multi-Culture Education	15	13	47	33		6
Bilingual Education	8	38	50	12		
Leadership Effect	8	38	38	25		
Study Techniques	7	29	57	14		
Credential Evaluation	3	33	67			
Rivas Test	12	17	33	33	8	8
Mini-Corps Film	8	25	75			
Media Teaching	7	29	71			

3.0 Concerning service to migrant clients, typical external evaluator comments follow:

90%-95% of those replying to this question answered in an unqualified affirmative. No one answered in the negative. There was however, a 5%-10% who express some confusion as to what "serving directly" means. Since the teaching situations are almost as diverse as the number of assistants, I do not believe that the general questions could be further refined to accommodate more.

All Mini-Corps students are providing direct service to migrant children. The numbers they work with weekly range from eight (8) to twenty (20) with an average weekly direct service of 13 per Mini-Corps student.

All Mini-Corps students provided direct service to migrant pupils. Number of pupils contacted weekly ranged from eight to thirty five with a mean of twenty one.

The migrant pupil workloads were approximately half a school day. This amounted to between 15 to 20 hours per school week. The Mini-Corps students work mainly with small groups. They seem confident in working with regular pupils. Teacher comments: "Mini-Corpsmen are dependable and well organized. They enjoy working with all students."

It appears that there isn't any question that is real in the minds of those interviewed so that the answer to this question is in the affirmative. However, if an assistant is supervising a group (such as a recess or P.E.) where all migrant children are, plus some others are involved, would this mitigate a 100% affirmative answer?

4.1 Are teacher assistants functioning at levels of competence commensurate with their training and skills?

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	5	6	--	--

Typical Comments:

All teachers interviewed expressed their approval of competence demonstrated by the Mini-Corps students. Teacher comments: "Very competent individuals." Principal comments: "They work well with all children. Their training prepares them quite well."

Mini-Corps students performed their teaching assignments with little outside direction. Teachers comment: "They (Mini-Corps student) seemed to be well prepared and trained for working in the classroom."

A clear majority answer this question in the affirmative. The reason given is that the assistants have something which is helpful to the teacher (language) and so are used in this capacity. One assistant objected to being used for clerical duties which she considered not to be on a level with her training and abilities.

Only one Mini-Corps student answered no to this item. This single exception was the result of assignment to a junior high school with a rotating schedule that made it impossible for the Mini-Corps student to work consistently with the same children. Mini-Corps student comments included statements like:

"I am preparing and presenting lesson plans."
"I have my own reading, math and spelling groups."
"I'm working with groups, developing my own lesson plans."

All, but one, Mini-Corps students were doing work appropriate to their level of experience. Their self report on this item confirmed what this evaluator observed. They are preparing, conducting and evaluating instruction on an individual, group and class basis. Observations of Mini-Corps student ranging from first grade, small group language development thru high school science lecture/discussion classes were made. They were highly competent performances. Mini-Corps student response to this question resulted in all positive ratings with the average rating being 3.23. Typical Mini-Corps student comments were:

"Definitely! I have ample independence to plan and present lessons."
"I've had varied experience throughout my Mini-Corps career. Now I'm getting more specialized training."

4.2 Describe inservice (e.g. workshops) programs offered for Mini-Corps students by Team Leader/Coordinator. Are such workshops adequate for meeting the needs of the teacher assistants and migrant pupils they serve? Are objectives for workshops formulated? Are outside lecturers/experts utilized?

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	4	3	3	1

Typical evaluator comments:

Workshops were relevant, adequately organized, and informative. Long range planning (especially scheduling) of workshops was inadequate. Many of the Mini-Corps students complained of poor timing, inconvenience and last minute announcements. Objectives were not clearly stated. It appears that many workshops were ad hoc programs designed to take advantage of the availability of a curriculum expert or focus on some emerging need of the Mini-Corps students. Participant reactions to the workshops were mixed. Most Mini-Corps students rated them good, only three rating them excellent. Verbatim comments by Mini-Corps students included the following:

"Very informative but badly timed."
"Adequate. Better than most years."
"Applicable to classroom."
"At times very inconvenient."

The workshops cover the areas of classroom management, classroom discipline, puppetry, lesson presentations and lesson preparations. About one-half of the assistants interviewed considered all workshops were valuable. The remainder considered them valuable to some degree. None were completely negative.

The workshops depend strongly on outside resources who are uniformly subject experts. While the workshops were on the whole well-rated by the assistants, linguistics and puppetry seemed to be the workshops that they had the most praise for.

During these interviews, no assistants expressed a totally negative reaction to the workshops presented. All felt that the workshops had, in the main, been advantageous. A minority were able to single out the type of experience they learned most from puppetry, motivation and discipline.

Workshops were developed as needed and to take advantage of resource availability. Reactions to the workshops were mixed. None of the Mini-Corps students were enthusiastic about their adequacy. Typical Mini-Corps student reactions were:

"Very helpful, learned a lot and have applied it."
"Some helpful, but not all."
"Good but not as useful as they could be."
"Majority but not all, useful."
"Outside lectures should be used more."

Better preparation, scheduling and statement of objectives for the workshops are needed.

The workshops offered seemed adequate in meeting the needs of the Mini-Corps students and migrant pupils they work with. The students were pleased with the workshops, especially "Migrant travel and Migrant Travel Experience", "Parents' attitude toward Education", and "Cultural clashes and superstitions."

4.3 Assess supervision provided by Team Leader/Coordinator. Are adequate/frequent classroom observation visits made? Describe nature of feedback provided to teacher assistants and supervising teachers by Team Leader/Coordinator. How do Team Leaders/Coordinators evaluate performance of Mini-Corps teacher assistants?

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	5	3	2	1

Typical evaluator statements:

There were mixed reactions to the classroom supervision (observation/evaluation visits) made by the College Coordinator. School principals unanimously reported satisfaction with the professional manner in which the Mini-Corps students were supervised. A majority of the Master Teachers were satisfied with the quality and quantity of in-class observation. The Mini-Corps students, however, were more often than not critical of the amount of observation done. This evaluator was concerned about the lack of adequate written evaluations of Mini-Corps students classroom performance. In-class observation and consultation was the weak area for the coordinator this year.

Typical Mini-Corps students comments illustrate their reactions:

"Not enough supervision."
"Good supervision. Answered all my questions."
"Hardly commented, wasn't there too often."
"Not consistent enough, good when he comes."
"Coordinator needs an assistant. Does what he can and does it very good."

All personnel interviewed, without any prompting on the evaluator's part, expressed an awareness of the size of coordinators' areas of supervision. None said that they were under or over supervised, and none felt that feedback was in any way inadequate. One assistant felt that in backing him up the team leader was overly aggressive and that this compromised him with the supervising teacher.

Visits by team leader are adequate and feedback to assistants is good. There are no complaints of over supervision. Suggestions made are constructive and never offensive. Team leader appears to be on good terms with teachers and administration.

The college coordinator's supervision was viewed as inadequate by the Mini-Corps students. Fifteen of the seventeen respondents answered no to the question of adequate classroom observations. On-site visits, especially the last three months of the program, averaged less than one per month. The Mini-Corps students were uniformly critical of this low rate of visits.

Typical comments were:

> "Started out (the year) energetic, then gave too much work, never visited the school."
> "Did not visit classroom enough; tried to be of help when we visited the office."
> "Not enough observations; should be more visits."

School principal and master teachers were not critical of the college coordinator's supervision. They seldom saw him, but they felt no need so to do. Clearly there is not enough on-site supervision provided the Mini-Corps students. The classroom observation training provided by Mr. Ken Young was not used. In the future it should be used. The college coordinator kept adequate records and adequately counseled the Mini-Corps students in other than classroom settings. This is not enough, and the Mini-Corps students clearly felt that way.

There seemed well established rapport with the coordinator and supervising teachers. Feedback is well accepted by the teachers. Student performance is evaluated by reviewing the students Mini-Corps file. Also by having supervising teachers feedback.

The team leader's aim was to visit each student at least once a week, but her own need to attend educational meetings related to her work took more time than she felt she could afford. She was always available for individual conferences and in fact spent a disproportionate amount of time with several students who were experiencing difficulties.

Feedback is provided by meeting with the supervising teacher and Mini-Corps student individually or during the regular Mini-Corps students meeting. Student evaluation is conducted by observation and Coordinator-Supervising Teacher evaluation form.

The coordinator was pleasant and demonstrated a position of concern for the Mini-Corps program, students and personnel involved with the program. There was much interaction between the coordinator and students. Mini-Corps student: "One thing I like about my coordinator, is that she is very organized and keeps us well informed about everything."

4.4 Study record keeping and comment on thoroughness of teacher assistant profiles and records. Are work logs collected, analyzed and utilized for the supervision of student workloads in a timely fashion to insure that student workloads meet objectives and requirements of the Mini-Corps Program? Are checklist evaluations used to guide the professional growth of the student? Are Spanish proficiency and Cultural Awareness examination results available and used to counsel students?

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	4	2	5	

Typical evaluator comments:

The coordinator did a very careful and consistent job of maintaining appropriate records and monitoring Mini-Corps students performance. He is a thorough administrator with a good eye for detail. He clearly keeps on top of his job and takes action when trouble occurs or seems imminent.

Work logs are kept by the assistants and are sent to coordinator for analysis and supervision utilizations. Both assistants and supervising teachers report that assistants' time is used in classroom presentations and not in record keeping. One assistant did any record keeping of an extensive nature and did not feel she was being properly utilized.

Record keeping is restricted to that which the assistants keep for the team leader and for that required by Mini-Corps. Most assistants feel that were they required to do extensive record keeping, their skills of a more important nature could not be fully utilized.

Adequate records are kept. Work logs are collected monthly. However, these work logs could be more carefully edited and validated. One Mini-Corps student had clearly not worked fulltime during the month of May. This was noted by the coordinator after the check (full pay) was issued to the Mini-Corps student. The coordinator has since acted to correct this error. More careful record keeping and validation will reduce, and possibly eliminate problems of this kind.

Percent of required paper work turned in by coordinators ranked in same order as part 1.0 showing positive correlation between higher rated coordinators and completion of administrative tracks:

Coordinator	% Rated "Excellent"	% of Administrative Assignment Done
A	89	95
B	86	90
C	79	100
D	75	90
E	59	90
F	50	80
G	50	70
H	43	70
I	38	60
J	25	50
K	0	30

4.5 Seven evaluators observed the rocords were routinely kept by teacher assistants to monitor migrant pupil progress, four reported that records were not kept.

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	5	2	4	

Typical evaluator comments:

All personnel interviewed were impressed with Mini-Corps ability to increase the learning potential of children.

Teacher comments: "Juan could not read english until he began working with the Mini-Corps students." "The migrant child's vocabulary has increased drastically since being with the Mini-Corps student."

Pupil progress records are kept but they are not kept well. Each school has its own approach to monitoring pupil performance. Most of it seems to be based on teacher/Mini-Corps student personal perceptions. Teachers and Mini-Corps students uniformly report migrant pupil gains. Only occasionally, however, is there a substantive data base indicated. Demonstrable pupil progress remains the weakest area in the program. Teacher cited evidence includes the following:

"Three years ago no migrants graduating (high school). This semester twelve."
"Two years ago 10% migrants made twelfth grade. This semest[illegible] 31%."

Yes, these records are kept by the supervising teacher, or the administration. Mini-Corps assistants are contributing most strongly by supplying Spanish speaking background for those children who as yet cannot be reached in English. As important is the supplying of the Spanish strand in Bilingual Education programs. They are also important as role models. They express an empathy for the children because of similar background and experiences.

Records that monitor children's progress are kept but in most cases are kept by a migrant pupil aide, or the teacher. Pre-tests and post-tests do indicate that the smaller groups, which are made possible by the Mini-Corps assistants, facilitates progress. This, plus a break in the language barrier are made by the Mini-Corps assistants. Though less easy to monitor, the assistant provides as well a much needed role model.

Teachers and Mini-Corps students report a variety of efforts to record pupil progress. These efforts range from achievement tests to perceived attitude improvement in migrant children. All personnel interviewed agreed that the Mini-Corps students contributed substantially but not exclusively to migrant pupil progress.

The Mini-Corps assistants, in 50% of the assignments, work in a classroom without a bilingual teacher or aide. Therefore, their special value is obvious in this regard. However, their value as role models is equally apparent in 100% of their assignments. It is unlikely that the migrant child has had any person in his home or school, comparable.

4.6 Central Mini-Corps administrative and support services were reported as available to college coordinators on 10 of 11 locations by external evaluators.

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	5	5		1

Typical evaluator comments:

Reactions to this item were consistently positive. No problems of consequence were perceived by any interviewees. For the most part the respondents reported no concern about or awareness of the functions of the central administration.

The response to this question was unusually knowledgeable. I say this because this question in other years and areas normally was answered by "I don't know." The majority had an opinion which was not only positive but backed up by some antidotal experience.

No problems were reported by the coordinator, or any school personnel, Mini-Corps students tended to be puzzled by the question. Typical Mini-Corps students comments were:

"Couldn't say because I've never had to deal with them."
"No contact."
"Adequate."

In the absence of special problems, the central administration should be unobtrusive. There were no special problems. They were unobtrusive.

Even though the primary source for this evaluation is the team leader, the assistants at times do have an opportunity to judge support services in regard to problem solving, crisis intervention or advice. They seem to feel that, to their knowledge, these processes functioned well. There were of course many with no opinion.

The coordinator and student interviewed indicated no lack of central Mini-Corps of fine support for their program.

4.7 Seven evaluators reported that coordinators do and four reported that they do not stress community involvement. Six evaluators observed that teacher assistants do and five evaluators observed that teacher assistants do not make routine home visits.

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	4	2	5	

Typical evaluator comments:

The Mini-Corps students were used sparingly in home visits, usually in special circumstances only, since this assignment was handled by the Migrant Education Aides. All were encouraged to assist with parent interviews, community programs, and open house. Their efforts were well received by parents and community individuals.

The assistants seem to fall into two divergent patterns. There are those who do not participate in any degree in community activities as their work, study, commuting time and residence location makes it impossible. There are also those whose in-depth commitment to the community is of considerable importance to the community. This includes work in AMAE and MAPA and telecasting of the Spanish speaking viewpoint.

The Mini-Corps students were not required to do home visits. However, they were encouraged to meet the parents and acquaint themselves with the migrant families. More emphasis was not made on community involvement because time was not available for the Mini-Corps students to get meaningfully involved. Full time college students with half time jobs can't do much else. In spite of this a surprising amount of family and personal contacts were made by the Mini-Corps students. At the high schools they were viewed as vitally important role models contributing significantly to the reduction of Chicano vs. Mexicano stress and conflict. At the elementary level, they participated in field trip organization, parent conferences, open house and special home visits when needed.

As is the case in other areas, assistants are informed of the <u>importance</u> of community involvement, but thereafter are not pressured in this regard as all are already carrying heavy work-school loads. Any added time consuming activity might easily result in an inability to carry the total load or an endangering of health. Almost all make home visits and report the usual very good results due to Mexican respect for educational personnel.

The assistants fall into two broad groups. If home visits are included in community involvement, then the preponderant majority are active. If home visits are not included, then there is a sizeable minority so involved. The team leader does not wish to push this very far for fear of importuning assistants who are already overactive.

The community involvement was clearly evident. "The Mini-Corps students are a cultural bridge between the school and Mexican American community." "Parents are very receptive and have shown increased interest in the school and Mini-Corps program."

Community involvement was strongly stressed by the Coordinator.

Coordinator: "I support community activities. They are a means for having the community aware of our programs."

Principal: "The Mini-Corps students translated our parent questionaire to Spanish. This resulted in having the largest parent turnout at our school."

4.8 External evaluators <u>unanimously</u> observed that supervising teachers of teacher assistants are in full compliance with the (5) Mini-Corps objectives and that the supervising teachers do conduct weekly lesson planning sessions with their teacher assistants.

Summary Evaluator Ratings =

Rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	6	4		1

Typical evaluator comments:

All supervising teachers had the opportunity to work with, evaluate and advise the Mini-Corps students. They were highly impressed with their performance and recommended the continuation of the program.

Teacher comments: "There is very little I can help her with. She is self motivated and will make a fine teacher."

Typical reactions of Mini-Corps students to their master teachers are:

"Best I've ever known, feel they are concerned for migrants."
"Used my labor effectively, very interested in helping the students."
"Excellent person, really helps, gives feedback."
"We work together as a team, get positive and negative feedback."

All of the Mini-Corps students were positive in their reaction to this question. Master teachers were viewed as competent, committed and caring. Mini-Corps students' verbatim comments on this item are as follows:

"Teachers very cooperative."
"Get along well--gives me good ideas."
"Comply very well."
"Most of them do--occasionally a dumbo."

Evaluator observations of the master teachers agree with the Mini-Corps students' reactions. Only one master teacher interviewed was less than impressive. Unfortunately this was a teacher with a large migrant enrollment. Mini-Corps students should be placed there even though they will not learn as much from the master teacher as desirable.

From interviews and observation it was quite clear that teachers do evaluate and advise their Mini-Corps students. "The Mini-Corps students usually need very little advise or direction." "They seemed to be well prepared for classroom learning activity."

5.0 The following table includes samples of 5 day work weeks for 9 coordinators; samples were taken throughout the work year (September, November, January, etc.). The data probably represent an average weekly workload for coordinators:

COORDINATOR WEEKLY ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

N = 9 5 WORK DAYS

ACTIVITY	AVERAGE HOURS PER COORDINATOR	PERCENT OF TIME	TOTAL TIME IN HOURS
Planning	4.11	8.01	37
Professional Growth	7.56	14.72	68
Recruitment	2.22	4.33	20
Placement	1.56	3.03	14
Training Inservice	1.33	2.60	12
Supervision	14.56	28.35	131
Consultations	2.11	4.11	19
Community Involvement	1.33	2.60	12
Counseling M/C Assistants	3.78	7.36	34
Administrative	6.44	12.55	58
Travel	6.33	12.34	57
TOTALS	51.29	100.00	462

The monthly workload for September only shows higher percentages of time spent on recruitment less on supervision:

COORDINATOR MONTHLY ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

N = 6

ACTIVITY	AVERAGE HOURS PER COORDINATOR	PERCENT OF TIME	TOTAL TIME IN HOURS
Planning	18.50	11.81	111
Professional Growth	5.00	3.19	30
Recruitment	21.50	13.72	129
Placement	10.33	6.60	62
Training Inservice	7.50	4.79	45
Supervision	7.17	4.57	43
Consultations	26.17	16.70	157
Community Involvement	13.33	8.51	80
Counseling M/C Assistants	18.50	11.81	111
Administrative	20.83	13.30	125
Travel	7.83	5.00	47
TOTALS	156.66	100.00	940

Overall evaluator ratings of coordinators' performance were mixed as shown by evaluation summary ratings:

Rating of Coordinators	Excellent	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Number of evaluators	5	3	3	1

Typical evaluator comments reflect some mixed attitudes toward performance of coordinators as a group:

Perceptions of the college coordinator varied greatly. School principals uniformly felt he was thorough and appropriate in his discharge of administrative duties. They had no complaints about his work. Teachers were more mixed in their reactions. Most felt he kept them properly informed, and was efficient in handling the few personnel problems that occurred. Still a few teachers reported uncertainty as to their role and function in the program and others were critical of the quantity of direct supervision provided the Mini-Corps students. On this latter point the Mini-Corps students were highly critical. The coordinator simply did not observe and critique Mini-Corps students enough. This year's effort by the program coordinator was weak in the area of consultation, personal support services, and on-site observation evaluation of Mini-Corps students. He did not get enough direct classroom contact with the Mini-Corps students for them to be satisfied. To his credit the coordinator recognized the legitimacy of this complaint and regretted its accuracy. Apparently most of the damage was done the last two or three months of the program.

The coordinator was well liked and considered a highly qualified and professional person.

Principal: "We enjoy working with coordinator very much. She is well organized and a credit to the program."

Student: "I don't think there is another person that really cares for the Mini-Corps students like she does."

The coordinator from observation, seemed confident in the responsibilities required for directing a Mini-Corps program. The only concern was his lack of organizational skills. Teachers and students were concerned over their not being notified of an evaluation visit.

The coordinator does a uniformly excellent job of managing the program. He keeps careful records, handles personnel problems efficiently and fairly, communicates effectively with school personnel, is a sound contributor to program planning with the central administration and the university faculty. His interest and competency in administrative tasks perhaps detract from his direct supervision of Mini-Corps students. It appears to this evaluator that he made administrative tasks his priority to the neglect of the educational task of observation/evaluation. The low ratings given by Mini-Corps students to the coordinator on quantity of observation were discussed at length in a conference with this evaluator. In this conference it was stressed that the educational task should be top priority. Frequent systematic and written observations were recommended for future emphasis by the coordinator. More specifically, a minimum of twenty hours per week should be scheduled for classroom observations with at least one written per month.

All personnel interviewed were satisfied with the coordinator's work. He is well liked by his students and works well with teachers and administrators.

Additional summary ratings of 8 coordinators by external evaluators follows:

CHECKLIST EVALUATION OF COORDINATORS BY EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

N = 8 COORDINATORS

	High Consistently Meets or Exceeds Standards	Acceptable Meets All Standards	Some Improvement Needed* Meets Most Standards With Some Improvement Needed	Unacceptable* Must Improve Performance
1. Implements all policies, directives and contractual agreements issued by Mini-Corps relating to summer school programs.	5	3		
2. Assumes daily responsibility for the supervision of 15 Mini-Corps students in all of their service-related activities, including classroom instructional tasks, extended day and authorized after school activities and home and community liaison services.	5	2	1	
3. Assesses the quantity and quality of work performed by Mini-Corps students by requiring and reviewing and approving Weekly Work Logs and by completing evaluations of all Mini-Corps students at such times and in such form as may be required by Mini-Corps.	3	4	1	
4. Monitors the appropriateness of the job placements of all Mini-Corps students and recommends to the Director any changes in location of work stations as may be indicated by deficient student performance or by any other inappropriateness of a given student's assigned work station.	3	4	1	
5. Communicates and distributes all Mini-Corps materials and information to school district personnel, Mini-Corps students and Regional Migrant Office personnel. Explains all Mini-Corps program policies and components to interested parties. Acts as the primary liaison person between Mini-Corps and local education agencies in which Mini-Corps students are assigned.	4	3	1	

CHECKLIST EVALUATION OF COORDINATORS

Page 2

	High Consistently Meets or Exceeds Standards	Acceptable Meets All Standards	Some Improvement Needed* Meets Most Standards With Some Improvement Needed	Unacceptable* Must Improve Performance
6. Participates in any special studies research or curriculum development or inservice training programs that Mini-Corps may engage in cooperation with Regional Migrant Office, school districts or the State.	4	4		
7. Renders advice and consultation to Mini-Corps students and participating teachers concerning curriculum matters, child development and the needs of migrant children.	3	4	1	
8. Participates in group planning and evaluation meetings and offers recommendations for improvement of all aspects of the summer Mini-Corps Program.	2	5	1	
9. Makes periodic classroom visitations and confers with supervising teachers concerning the performance of Mini-Corps students and the development and implementation of approved programs for migrant pupils.	5	1	2	

* Explanations required on separate sheets along with recommendations for improvement.

6.0 The average coordinator (N=10), supervised the average teacher assistant = .4995 hour per week. Five coordinators met Mini-Corps' lowest acceptable standard of .5 hour/week (or 1 hour every 2 weeks) and five did not. The supervision records of the 10 coordinators follow from high to low:

Coordinator	Average hours per week spent on the average teacher assistant
A	1.043
B	.654
C	.640
D	.593
E	.500
F	.456
G	.392
H	.294
I	.280
J	.143

7.0 The following table summarizes teacher assistants satisfaction with the overall Mini-Corps program throughout the school year. The table displays the percent of teacher assistants rating 12 key program factors:

FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED		BY PERCENT			
	NUMBER	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
1. The quality of my classroom experience	140	41	54	4	1
2. The supervision I received from my coordinator	143	38	38	18	5
3. The supervision I received from my classroom supervising teacher	140	43	44	11	1
4. The overall quality of the inservice training I received this school year	142	35	57	8	
5. The quality of my college course work in preparing me to teach migrant children	137	23	47	23	7
6. Communications with statewide Mini-Corps headquarters	137	10	32	42	15
7. Overall effectiveness of this Mini-Corps Program in meeting the local needs of migrant children in our area	142	40	45	13	1
8. Support, advice and services we provided to migrant families in our community	135	21	56	20	3

FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED	NUMBER	BY PERCENT			
		EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
9. Effectiveness of our local Mini-Corps Home Visitation Program	115	17	49	30	4
10. School and community acceptance of our local Mini-Corps	134	45	47	7	1
11. How would you rate your school year Mini-Corps program to prospective Mini-Corpspersons?	141	45	48	6	
12. Communication with Migrant Education Regional Personnel	134	15	31	37	17

8.0 The following table summarizes the workloads of 127 teacher assistants working for 9 coordinators for Fall 1979. The table shows the average hours per month of categorical services for migrant pupils expended, the percent of total time expended on each categorical service and the total hours expended for the 3 month work period.

ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES YOU PERFORMED	AVERAGE HOURS	TOTAL HOURS	PERCENT OF TIME
Arts and Crafts (002)	2.32	295	3.22
Bicultural (including Cultural Awareness) (020)	1.35	171	1.86
English as a Second Language (030)	5.43	690	7.53
English Language Arts (including Reading) (053)	9.91	1259	13.73
Math (129)	8.02	1019	11.11
Music/Drama/Dance (024)	1.10	140	1.53
Oral Language Development (English) (075)	4.61	585	6.38
Physical Education	1.14	145	1.58
Playground Supervision or Field Trips	1.48	188	2.05
Science	2.06	261	2.85
Social Science (067)	2.78	353	3.85
Spanish Language Arts (064)	3.53	448	4.89
Other (specify) CMC PUPPETRY (165)	1.51	192	2.09
TOTAL TIME SPENT ON INSTRUCTING MIGRANT PUPILS	45.24	5746	62.67
Inservice Training	6.98	886	9.67
Preparation Time (for Curriculum and Lesson Planning)	7.72	981	10.70
Community Activity, Recreation, Social Services	2.52	320	3.49
Consultation to Family (re: Welfare, Advocacy, Social Health Services)	.37	47	.51
Translation Services (for school or family)	.53	67	.73
Home Visitation (re: Pupil)	1.68	213	2.32
Other (specify)	1.75	223	2.43
Counseling to Students	1.96	249	2.72
General Administration Tasks (filling out forms, clerical or MSRTS).	1.78	226	2.47
Other (specify)	1.65	210	2.29
TOTAL TIME SPENT ON OTHER THAN INSTRUCTION	26.94	3422	37.33
GRAND TOTAL	72.18	9168	100.00

9.0 The following (2) tables summarize the ratings of teacher assistants by their supervising teachers at the end of their work experience (May 1980).

For community colleges, 51 teacher assistants were evaluated who worked for 5 different coordinators and 51 supervising teachers. Results were below standards for previous years with 14 of 34 factors rated below Mini-Corps minimum standards.

For university programs, 63 teacher assistants working for 5 coordinators were rated by 63 supervising teachers. As for past years, all of the factors rated met or exceeded Mini-Corps standards.

CHECKLIST EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
TEACHER ASSISTANTS PERFORMANCE

ACTIVITIES EVALUATED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
1. Understanding of migrant children and sensitivity to their needs.	49	45	43	12		
2. Help provided to the teacher in understanding the needs of migrant children.*	45	33	44	22		
3. Understanding of his role and his relationships with the teacher in the classroom in the special handling of migrant pupils.	49	29	55	16		
4. Effectiveness in providing actual instruction in Spanish as needed.	46	39	48	11	2	
5. Effectiveness as an interpreter between teachers and Spanish-speaking children and parents.	28	64	32	4		
6. Effectiveness in assisting with instruction in Mexican American history and culture.*	18	33	44	22		
7. Effectiveness as a suitable role model for migrant children.	49	39	47	12	2	
8. Effectiveness in assisting with followup of absenteeism of migrant children.	16	63	31	6		
9. Ability to manage and control small groups of children.	41	29	54	12	5	
10. Coordinators home visits and reports feedback to teacher.	10	50	40	10		
11. Demonstrated ability to work cooperatively and harmoniously with peers and professional staff.	47	38	47	13	2	
12. Decorum	44	50	48	2		
13. Health and Vitality	46	41	50	9		
14. Personal Appearance	50	42	46	10	2	
15. Poise	50	34	54	12		
16. Voice and Speech *	49	22	45	29	4	

* THESE ITEMS ARE LOWER THAN MINI-CORPS MINIMUM STANDARDS

CHECKLIST EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES - CONTINUED

ACTIVITIES EVALUATED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
17. Judgment *	50	22	48	22	8	
18. Creativity *	36	31	36	28	6	
19. Initiative *	36	28	36	25	11	
20. Punctuality *	41	34	46	15	5	
21. Attendance *	41	39	34	20	7	
22. General rapport with and acceptance by pupils.	40	60	30	8	3	
23. Enthusiasm	50	40	44	14	2	
24. Sense of Humor	43	40	47	14		
25. Dependability *	51	35	45	10	10	
26. Originality *	42	26	50	24		
27. Personal Integrity	50	48	40	12		
28. Respects attitudes and opinions of others.	49	49	45	6		
29. Innovation *	39	33	38	26	3	
30. Accepts constructive criticism and suggestions.	48	40	52	8		
31. Exhibits leadership potential *	48	38	35	23	4	
32. Oral and written expression in English.*	45	22	49	20	9	
33. Oral and written expression in Spanish.	38	26	58	13	3	
34. Ability to motivate students. *	47	28	49	19	4	

50. I believe this person has the following potential as a teacher:* (N = 18)

- 33 Outstanding
- 33 Above Average
- 22 Average
- 6 Below Average
- 6 Should be encouraged to consider another profession

* THESE ITEMS ARE LOWER THAN MINI-CORPS MINIMUM STANDARDS

CHECKLIST EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITIES TEACHER ASSISTANTS PERFORMANCE

ACTIVITIES EVALUATED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
1. Understanding of migrant children and sensitivity to their needs.	61	75	23	2		
2. Help provided to the teacher in understanding the needs of migrant children.	50	40	58	2		
3. Understanding of his role and his relationships with the teacher in the classroom in the special handling of migrant pupils.	61	56	41	2	2	
4. Effectiveness in providing actual instruction in Spanish as needed.	59	66	31	3		
5. Effectiveness as an interpreter between teachers and Spanish-speaking children and parents.	45	67	33			
6. Effectiveness in assisting with instruction in Mexican American history and culture.	33	39	58	3		
7. Effectiveness as a suitable role model for migrant children.	62	55	44		2	
8. Effectiveness in assisting with followup of absenteeism of migrant children.	27	41	44	15		
9. Ability to manage and control small groups of children	57	51	39	9	2	
10. Coordinates home visits and reports feedback to teacher	24	50	46	4		
11. Demonstrated ability to work cooperatively and harmoniously with peers and professional staff.	57	58	40	2		
12. Decorum	60	60	38		2	
13. Health and Vitality	63	56	37	8		
14. Personal Appearance	63	63	35	2		
15. Poise	62	55	44	2		
16. Voice and Speech	63	51	44	5		
17. Judgment	63	48	49	2		
18. Creativity	58	55	26	19		
19. Initiative	55	53	36	9	2	
20. Punctuality	55	49	40	9	2	

ALL FACTORS WERE RATED ABOVE MINI-CORPS MINIMUM STANDARDS

ACTIVITIES EVALUATED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
21. Attendance	55	45	7	2		
22. General rapport with and acceptance by pupils	55	65	33	2		
23. Enthusiasm	62	68	27	5		
24. Sense of Humor	59	61	36	3		
25. Dependability	62	63	31	5	2	
26. Originality	61	51	34	15		
27. Personal Integrity	61	67	30	3		
28. Respects attitudes and opinions of others	57	74	24	2		
29. Innovation	54	46	37	17		
30. Accepts constructive criticism and suggestions	61	69	28	3		
31. Exhibits leadership potential	62	58	31	11		
32. Oral and written expression in English	55	45	53	2		
33. Oral and written expression in Spanish	50	48	48	4		
34. Ability to motivate students	58	53	47			
PART II: FOR USE ONLY WITH UPPER DIVISION AND EXPERIENCED MINI-CORPS TEACHER ASSISTANTS, ITEMS 35 THROUGH 52						
35. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques of teaching and working with migrant children	28	50	50			
36. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques of English as a Second Language	26	50	42	8		
37. Ability to bring forth an awareness of the educational program to the parents in the community	14	64	36			
38. Interest and sincerity in providing ideas, opinions at Parent Advisory Meetings, Board Meetings, Teacher Meetings or other group activities	7	57	43			
39. A general knowledge of subject matter(s) taught. List and note subject matter.						
Math and Arithmetic	26	58	42			
Bilingual instruction including ESL	22	50	41	9		
Science	10	70	30			
Social Science	17	59	41			
Other	14	86	14			
40. Skill in lesson planning and organization	28	57	32	11		
41. Knowledge and use of teaching methods	32	34	59	6		
42. Demonstrated knowledge of techniques for consistent pupil control and classroom management	32	47	38	16		
43. Knowledge of commonly used standardized tests and published norms and ability to interpret these instru-instruments.	15	33	60	7		

ALL FACTORS WERE RATED ABOVE MINI-CORPS MINIMUM STANDARDS

ACTIVITIES EVALUATED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS	NUMBER	OUTSTANDING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DOES NOT APPLY
44. Professional attitude toward cooperating teacher	32	78	22			
45. Knowledge of and operation of media equipment	23	52	35	13		
46. Ability to construct and utilize instructional materials for non-English-speaking students	27	63	37			
47. Ability to diagnose learning needs of pupils	27	41	59			
48. Ability to prescribe individualized instruction	26	62	35	4		
49. Competency to instruct reading and oral language development programs	30	57	43			

50. I believe this person has the following potential as a teacher: (N = 43)

56 Outstanding

40 Above Average

5 Average

_____ Below Average

_____ Should be encouraged to consider another profession

ALL FACTORS WERE RATED ABOVE MINI-CORPS MINIMUM STANDARDS

Lastly, teacher assistants self ratings reflected comparative neglect of performance objectives III (Spanish Linguistic Competencies) and objectives IV (Translation Competencies). The self ratings follow:

Following are the approved performance objectives of Mini-Corps. After reading each of the five performance objectives, indicate by checking "yes" or "no" whether or not you obtained experience or training in how to perform these objectives during the past school year. Then, rate your overall growth and development toward these objectives.

I. "The Mini-Corps students will acquire cumulative competencies in diagnosing the learning needs of migrant children; designing, prescribing and assessing individualized instruction consistent with the California Master Plan."
Received Training during this school year: yes 83% no 17% (N=115)
On The Job Experience: yes 89% no 11% (N=110)
I have achieved: (N=123)

High Level	Average Level	Acceptance Some Improvement	I am Dissatisfied With My Level
33%	47%	19%	1%

II. "The Mini-Corps students will acquire competencies necessary to teach communication skills in English including: (a) Aural-oral language Development, (b) Reading Development, (c) Written Expression."
Received Training during this school year: yes 85% no 15% (N=114)
On The Job Experience: yes 91% no 9% (N=106)
I have achieved: (N=112)

High Level	Average Level	Acceptance Some Improvement	I am Dissatisfied With My Level
29%	47%	22%	2%

III. "The Mini-Corps students will acquire competencies that will enable them to enhance the personal development of migrant children through Spanish linguistic studies. Cultural studies including colloquial literature, drama, music, and fine arts."
Received Training during this school year: yes 65% no 35% (N=110)
On The Job Experience: yes 64% no 36% (N=107)
I have achieved: (N=101)

High Level	Average Level	Acceptance Some Improvement	I am Dissatisfied With My Level
22%	44%	28%	7%

IV. "The Mini-Corps students will acquire the competency to translate appropriate instructional materials for non-English-speaking migrant children and communications to their parents."
Received Training during this school year: yes 59% no 41% (N=116)
On The Job Experience: yes 82% no 18% (N=110)
I have achieved: (N=110)

High Level	Average Level	Acceptance Some Improvement	I am Dissatisfied With My Level
25%	52%	19%	4%

V. "The Mini-Corps students will acquire personal characteristics that will enhance their role as models for migrant children."
Received Training during this school year: yes 87% no 13% (N=113)
On The Job Experience: yes 94% no 6% (N=110)
I have achieved: (N=114)

High Level	Average Level	Acceptance Some Improvement	I am Dissatisfied With My Level
50%	36%	12%	2%

A D D E N D U M

MIGRANT PUPILS SERVED DURING SCHOOL YEAR 1979-80

COORDINATOR	NUMBER OF TEACHER ASSISTANTS	TOTAL MIGRANT PUPILS	AVERAGE MIGRANT PUPILS PER TEACHER ASSISTANT
Barbara Allen	12	141	12
Rosendo Garci	24	581	24
Olga Martinez	28	433	15
Jesse Modesto	6	88	15
Ray Munoz	10	154	15
Teresa Orozco	13	129	10
Manuel Sanchez	17	231	14
Dorothy Tuttle	17	322	19
TOTALS	127	2,079	16

PARTIAL REPORT:

Martha Rodriguez
Roberto Salinas
Donald G. Shamblin, Ph.D.